



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,954	10/14/2005	Gary Davidson	AAIRB.0102US	6879
22858	7590	11/29/2007		
CARSTENS & CAHOON, LLP P O BOX 802334 DALLAS, TX 75380			EXAMINER NGUYEN, HUY D	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/29/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/552,954

Applicant(s)

DAVIDSON ET AL.

Examiner

Huy D. Nguyen

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 7, 9-14, 17, 19-24, 27, 29, 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loder (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,720) in view of Wallenius (U.S. 6,625,268).

Regarding claims 1, 11, 21, 29, 31, 32, Loder teaches a mobile unit comprising memory and a storage medium, wherein the storage medium includes computer program code configured to perform the steps: retrieving from memory (e.g., SIM) an available amount of time that the mobile unit is authorized to utilize wireless services with the mobile unit (e.g., an ability to hold a record of amount of funds prepaid for at the point of the sale is incorporated within a subscriber identity module, SIM – see column 3, lines 26-28); allowing the mobile unit to utilize wireless services for a first time period, the first time period being less than or equal to the available amount; and deducting the first time period from the available amount (e.g., this payment record will progressively decrease as services of the network are used according to tariff rate which is either preprogrammed into the SIM or sent by the network – see column 3, lines 31-34). Loder does not explicitly teach that the prepaid fund is related to the amount of time. However, the preceding limitation is taught in Wallenius (e.g., user of a mobile station can purchase a smart card similar to the SIM card, in which a call time is preprogrammed for a given sum of money,

see column 3, lines 3-5). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Wallenius to the teaching of Loder to make clear to the user the amount of time available for a given sum of money.

Regarding claims 2, 12, 22, Loder teaches the mobile unit of claim 1, wherein the storage medium is a subscriber interface module (SIM) card (see column 3, lines 26-28).

Regarding claims 3, 13, 23, Loder teaches the mobile unit of claim 1, wherein the memory is a subscriber interface module (SIM) card (see column 3, lines 26-28).

Regarding claims 4, 14, 24, Loder teaches the mobile unit of claim 1, wherein the mobile unit utilizes the wireless services via GSM, CDMA, TDMA, or GPRS communications protocol (see column 4, lines 40-41).

Regarding claims 7, 17, 27, Loder teaches the mobile unit of claim 1, wherein the computer program code is further configured to provide a notification to the user when the available amount of time reaches one or more thresholds (see column 3, lines 33-34).

Regarding claims 9, 19, Loder teaches the mobile unit of claim 1, wherein the wireless services include receiving an incoming call (see column 3, lines 37-38).

Regarding claims 10, 20, Loder teaches the mobile unit of claim 1, wherein the wireless services include placing an outgoing call (see column 3, lines 37-38).

3. Claims 5, 15, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loder in view of Wallenius and in further view of Doran et al. (US 2006/0069642 A1).

Regarding claims 5, 15, 25, the combination of Loder and Wallenius teaches the claimed invention except to receive an indication that a user has prepaid for a second amount of time and

adding the second amount of time to the available amount of time. However, the preceding limitation is taught in Doran et al. (see paragraph [0035]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Doran et al. to the teaching of Loder and Wallenius for providing or reloading prepaid cash cards, phone cards.

4. Claims 6, 16, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loder in view of Doran et al. (US 2006/0069642 A1) and in further view of Laybourn et al. (US 2003/0008634 A1).

Regarding claims 6, 16, 26, the combination of Loder, Wallenius and Doran et al. teaches the claimed invention except the use of SMS. However, the preceding limitation is taught in Laybourn et al. (see the abstract). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Laybourn et al. to the teaching of Loder, Wallenius, and Doran et al. so that the provider can use SMS messages to update the device's memory to include an alternative tariff or rate table.

5. Claims 8, 18, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loder and Wallenius.

Regarding claims 8, 18, 28, the combination of Loder and Wallenius teaches the claimed invention except that the notification comprises an audio tone or a text message. However, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have the notification being an audio tone or a text message since the invention would perform equally well with the notification being either an audio tone or a text message.

6. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loder in view of Wallenius and Laybourn et al. (US 2003/0008634 A1).

Regarding claim 30, Loder and Wallenius teaches the claimed invention except the use of SMS. However, the preceding limitation is taught in Laybourn et al. (see the abstract). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Laybourn et al. to the teaching of Loder and Wallenius so that the provider can use SMS messages to update the device's memory to include an alternative tariff or rate table.

Contact Information


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy D. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-7845. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/552,954
Art Unit: 2617

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Huy D Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2617